



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,735	03/13/2007	Michael Powers	VEC-138-B (RUS0143)	5019
29296 7590 04/08/2010 JULIA CHURCH DIERKER DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 3331 W. BIG BEAVER RD. SUITE 109 TROY, MI 48084-2813			EXAMINER ROSATI, BRANDON MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 3744	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/08/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/582,735	POWERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRANDON M. ROSATI	3744	

All Participants:

(1) BRANDON M. ROSATI.

(2) Julia Dierker.

Date of Interview: 6 April 2010

Status of Application: After Final Amendment

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 2:15 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 2nd Rejection for claims 10-12 and 14, specifically claim 10

Claims discussed:

Claim 10

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Cheryl J. Tyler/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3744

/Brandon M Rosati/
Examiner, Art Unit 3744

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Brandon Rosati contacted Ms. Julia Dierker (Applicant's Attorney) to discuss the response to the 112 2nd rejection in applicant's submitted After Final Amendment. Examiner Rosati said he was unclear as to how the collar, not the tube maintained the tank foot in place as shown in Figure 7. Ms. Dierker pointed out that when the collar is inverted as shown in Figure 3, the tube does maintain the tank foot in place. Ms. Dierker further stated that Figure 7 showed a separate embodiment which they were not pursuing in this particular application. The Examiner agreed that the 112 2nd rejection should be withdrawn and that he would respond to the After Final Amendment.